

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-42 were presented for examination. The Office Action dated April 23, 2007 rejects claims 1-42. This paper amends claims 1-4, 11, 13, 14, 16, 26-29, 40, 41, and 42, and cancels claim 11.

The Examiner indicates that claims 1, 13, 26, and 41 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, as set forth in the Office Action. In addition, the Examiner indicates that claims 2-12, 14-25, and 27-39 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, as set forth in the Office Action. Applicant thanks Examiner Graham for clarifying the allowable subject matter.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 26, and 41 to cure the noted defects in order to overcome the § 112 rejection and have canceled claims 40 and 42 to remove any remaining impediments to allowance. Applicant submits that the amendment to claims 1, 13, 26, and 41 do not raise new issues requiring further consideration and that cancellation of claims 40 and 42 effectively eliminates any remaining issues in this application. Claims 1-39 and 41 remain pending.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-39, 41, and 42 under U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, the Office Action indicates that claims 1, 13, 26, and 41 lack a basis in the original disclosure for the recitation of “at least one of the one or more grooves having” terminology. Further, the Office Action indicates that the original disclosure only provides for each of the grooves having the changing depth property.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 26, and 41 to delete the “at least one” language such that the claims now recite that each of the grooves have

the changing depth property, in accordance with the Office Action.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment has overcome the rejection.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Office Action rejects claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas. In view of the cancellation of claim 40, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is moot.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Egon in view of Kuebler. In view of the cancellation of claim 42, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is moot.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments made herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests favorable action by the Examiner.

In addition, Applicant does not concede the validity of the rejection of any canceled claims, and expressly reserves the right to pursue such claims and other claims in a continuation and/or divisional patent application.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicant's representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-0932.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 15, 2007  
Reg. No. 41,274

Tel. No.: (508) 303-0932  
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/Michael A. Rodriguez/  
Michael A. Rodriguez  
Attorney for Applicant  
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP  
5 Mount Royal Avenue  
Marlborough, MA 01752